arXiv:1702.03808v1 [math.MG] 13 Feb 2017

# ON THE APPROXIMATION OF CONVEX BODIES BY ELLIPSES WITH RESPECT TO THE SYMMETRIC DIFFERENCE METRIC

JAIRO BOCHI

Abstract. We prove that for every planar centrally symmetric convex body $K$, among all ellipses $E$ with the same center and the same area as $K$, there exists a unique one for which the area of the symmetric difference $K \triangle E$ is minimal. We obtain this result by showing that this area is a strictly quasi-convex function of the ellipse $E$, with respect to a natural affine structure on the set of ellipses.

## 1. Introduction

There are many interesting ways to associate an ellipsoid to a convex body. If the convex body is centrally symmetric then its *Legendre ellipsoid* is the unique ellipsoid with the same center and the same momenta of inertia with respect to axes through the center. The *Löwner–John ellipsoids* are the unique ellipsoids of minimal (resp. maximal) volume containing (resp. contained in) a given convex body. The *Banach–Mazur ellipsoids* are also a pair of ellipsoids that sandwich a given convex body, but with the property that they are homothetic, with homothecy factor as close to 1 as possible. See e.g. [1, 2, 4, 6, 9] for much more information, including many connections to seemingly unrelated problems.

In this paper we consider the problem of approximating a given convex body by an ellipsoid of the same volume so to minimize the volume of the symmetric difference. Actually we consider only the two-dimensional case.

### 1.1. Statement of the results.

Let $\mathcal{K}$ be the set of all subsets $K \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ that are compact, convex, centrally symmetric ($K = -K$), and have area $\pi$. We endow this set with the *symmetric difference metric* (a.k.a. *Fréchet–Nikodym metric*):

$$d(K_1, K_2) := \operatorname{area}(K_1 \triangle K_2) = 2\pi - 2\operatorname{area}(K_1 \cap K_2)\,,$$

Let $\mathcal{E}$ be the subset of $\mathcal{K}$ formed by ellipses. Given $K \in \mathcal{K}$, consider its distance to $\mathcal{E}$, that is,

$$d(K, \mathcal{E}) := \inf_{E \in \mathcal{E}} d(K, E)\,.$$

An easy compactness argument shows that the infimum above is attained. Actually we will prove that the infimum is attained at a *unique* ellipse; in other words:

**Theorem 1.** *For every $K \in K$ there exists $E_{\text{best}} \in \mathcal{E}$ such that $d(K, E) > d(K, E_{\text{best}})$ for every other $E \in \mathcal{E}$.*

*Date*: February 13, 2017.
2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 52A10; 90C26, 51K99.
Partially supported by project Fondecyt 1140202 (Chile).

Without the assumptions of $K$ and $E$ being centrally symmetric, the question about uniqueness of the best approximation by ellipses was formulated by Włodek Kuperberg on MathOverflow [8] in December 2016.

Theorem 1 follows from sharper results, which we describe next. Consider the family of ellipses whose axes are the $x$ and $y$ axes, together with the unit circle. We parameterize this family by $t \in \mathbb{R}$ as follows:

$$E_t := \left\{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \,;\, e^t x^2 + e^{-t} y^2 \leqslant 1\right\}. \tag{1.1}$$

A function $f\colon \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ is called *quasiconvex* if for every $s$, $t$, $u \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$s < t < u \;\Rightarrow\; f(t) \leqslant \max\{f(s), f(u)\}\,.$$

The function is called *strictly quasiconvex* if the inequality on the right is always strict. Our crucial result is this:

**Theorem 2.** *For every $K \in \mathcal{K}$, the function $t \in \mathbb{R} \mapsto d(K, E_t)$ is strictly quasiconvex.*

Let us put this result in a broader perspective. We need a few definitions.

Let $\mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{R})$ denote the group of area preserving linear maps of $\mathbb{R}^2$. This group acts on the space $\mathcal{K}$ by isometries, preserving the subset $\mathcal{E}$. Note that given any two elements $E$, $F \in \mathcal{E}$, we can find some $L \in \mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{R})$ such that, in terms of notation (1.1), $L(E) = E_s$ and $L(F) = E_t$ for certain $s$, $t \in \mathbb{R}$; moreover if we ask that $t \geqslant s = 0$ then such $L$ becomes uniquely determined.

For each pair $E$, $F$ of elements of $\mathcal{E}$, we associate a subset $[E, F]$ of $\mathcal{E}$, called a *segment*. These sets are uniquely determined by the following requirements:

(a) $[F, E] = [E, F]$;
(b) $[LE, LF] = L[E, F]$ for every $L \in \mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{R})$;
(c) If $s \leqslant u$ are real numbers then, in terms of notation (1.1), $[E_s, E_u] = \left\{E_t \,;\, s \leqslant t \leqslant u\right\}$.

*Remark* 1.1. This definition of segments is not artificial. Indeed, in Appendix A we exhibit a metric $\bar{d}$ naturally associated to $d$ such that $(\mathcal{E}, \bar{d})$ is a geodesic metric space whose geodesic segments are exactly those defined above; moreover $(\mathcal{E}, \bar{d})$ is isometric (modulo a constant factor) to the hyperbolic plane $\mathbb{H}$, and the action of $\mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{R})$ on $\mathcal{E}$ corresponds to the action on $\mathbb{H}$ by orientation-preserving Möbius transformations.

Let us say that a set $X \subset \mathcal{E}$ is *convex* if $[E, F] \subset X$ for every pair $E$, $F \in X$. The set of *extreme points* of a convex set $X$ is defined as:

$$\operatorname{ext} X := \left\{E_* \in X \,;\, E_* \in [E, F] \subset X \;\Rightarrow\; E = E_* \text{ or } F = E_*\right\}.$$

Let us say that a function $f\colon \mathcal{E} \to \mathbb{R}$ is *quasiconvex* if for every $c \in \mathbb{R}$, the sublevel set $f^{-1}((-\infty, c])$ is convex. If, in addition, $f^{-1}(c) \subset \operatorname{ext} f^{-1}((-\infty, c])$ then we say that $f$ is *strictly quasiconvex*.

Theorem 2 can be reformulated as follows:

**Theorem 3.** *For every $K \in \mathcal{K}$, the function $E \in \mathcal{E} \mapsto d(K, E)$ is strictly quasiconvex.*

Note that:

$$\text{Theorem 2} \Rightarrow \text{Theorem 3} \Rightarrow \text{Theorem 1}.$$

Indeed, the first implication follows from the properties of the $\mathrm{SL}(2,\mathbb{R})$ action, and the second one follows from the fact that a strictly quasiconvex function cannot attain its minimum at two different points.

Theorem 2 itself will follow from more precise quantitative information on the area function, which we describe in the next subsection.

1.2. **Quantifying quasiconvexity.** Let $\mathcal{K}^\times$ be the subset of $K \in \mathcal{K}$ satisfying the following conditions:

(a) the boundary $\partial K$ is a $C^2$ curve;
(b) there is a finite set $T \subset \mathbb{R}$ such that for every $t \in \mathbb{R} \smallsetminus T$, the curves $\partial K$ and $\partial E_t$ are transverse;
(c) for every $t \in T$, every tangency between $\partial K$ and $\partial E_t$ is quadratic (i.e, the curves have a first- but not a second-order contact), and in particular the number of such tangencies is finite;
(d) the tangency points do not belong to the envelope hyperbola $xy = \pm 1/2$ of the family of curves $(\partial E_t)$.

**Proposition 1.2** (Denseness of transversality)**.** *The set $\mathcal{K}^\times$ is dense in $\mathcal{K}$.*

The proposition is a simple consequence of the transversality theorem; see Section 2.

The following is the core technical result of this paper, and its proof occupies Section 3:

**Proposition 1.3** (Quantitative quasiconvexity of the area function)**.** *Let $K \in \mathcal{K}^\times$, and let $T \subset \mathbb{R}$ be the corresponding (finite) set of tangency parameters. Then the function $A\colon \mathbb{R} \to (0, 2\pi)$ defined by*

$$A(t) := d(E_t, K) = \operatorname{area}(E_t \mathbin{\triangle} K)$$

*is $C^2$ except at $T$. Moreover:*

(a) *For every $t \in T$, the left and right derivatives of $A$ at $t$ exist in $[-\infty, +\infty]$, at least one of them is infinite, and $A'_-(t) < A'_+(t)$.*
(b) *For every $t \in \mathbb{R} \smallsetminus T$, we have:*

$$\min\left\{|A'(t)|, A''(t)\right\} > \delta \tag{1.2}$$

*for some $\delta > 0$. Moreover, if $\varepsilon > 0$ is such that $\varepsilon \leqslant A(t) \leqslant 2\pi - \varepsilon$ then $\delta$ depends only on $\varepsilon$, and not on $K$ nor $t$.*

The proposition implies that when $K \in \mathcal{K}^\times$ then the function $t \in \mathbb{R} \mapsto d(K, E_t)$ has no local maximum and therefore is strictly quasiconvex. More importantly, the proposition provides infinitesimal quasiconvexity properties that are uniform with respect to $K$. This uniformity, combined with the denseness provided by Proposition 1.2, will allow us to extend information from the subset $\mathcal{K}^\times$ to the whole space $\mathcal{K}$ (see Section 4) and so we will obtain Theorem 2.

## 2. Proof of Proposition 1.2

Let $\mathbb{P}^1$ denote the projective space of $\mathbb{R}^2$, i.e. the set of all lines through the origin. Let $[v] \in \mathbb{P}^1$ denote the line determined by a nonzero vector $v \in \mathbb{R}^2_*$.

If $\Gamma \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ is a smooth 1-dimensional submanifold, let $\hat{\Gamma} \subset \mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{P}^1$ be the set of pairs $(u, [v])$ such that $u \in \Gamma$ and $v$ is tangent to $\Gamma$ at $u$. Recalling notation (1.1), let $Z_2 := \bigcup_{t\in\mathbb{R}} \widehat{\partial E_t}$. Also let $Z_1 := \hat{H}$, where $H := \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \,;\, xy = \pm 1/2\}$.

**Lemma 2.1.** *$Z_2$ and $Z_1$ are closed smooth submanifolds of $\mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{P}^1$ of respective dimensions 2 and 1.*

The proof of Lemma 2.1 is postponed.

Let $\mathbb{T} := \mathbb{R}/2\pi\mathbb{Z}$, the additive group of real numbers mod $2\pi$. A *regular parametrization* of a smooth simple closed curve $\Gamma \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ is a map $g\colon \mathbb{T} \to \mathbb{R}^2$ that is a smooth diffeomorphism onto $\Gamma$. In that case, let $\hat{g}\colon \mathbb{T} \to \mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{P}^1$ denote the map $\hat{g}(\theta) := (g(\theta), [g'(\theta)])$, which is a smooth diffeomorphism onto $\hat{\Gamma}$.

**Lemma 2.2.** *Suppose $K \in \mathcal{K}$ has smooth boundary, and $g\colon \mathbb{T} \to \mathbb{R}^2$ is a regular parametrization of it. If $\hat{g}$ is transverse to both submanifolds $Z_1$ and $Z_2$ then $K \in \mathcal{K}^\times$.*

Let us also postpone the proof of this lemma, and use it to obtain the following:

**Proposition 2.3.** *If $K \in \mathcal{K}$ has smooth boundary then there is an open dense subset $U$ of $\mathrm{SL}(2,\mathbb{R})$ such that if $L \in U$ then $LK \in \mathcal{K}^\times$.*

*Proof.* Let $Y \subset \mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{P}^1$ be the set of pairs $(u, [v])$ such that $u$ and $v$ are linearly independent. Note that $Z_1$, $Z_2$ are subsets of $Y$. The group $\mathrm{SL}(2,\mathbb{R})$ acts on $Y$ in the obvious way: $L(u,[v]) = (Lu, [Lv])$. This action is smooth, transitive, and faithful; in particular $\mathrm{SL}(2,\mathbb{R})$ and $Y$ are diffeomorphic.

Let $g\colon \mathbb{T} \to \mathbb{R}^2$ be a regular parametrization of $\partial K$. Then $\hat{g}$ takes values in $Y$. The map $f\colon \mathbb{T} \times \mathrm{SL}(2,\mathbb{R}) \to Y$ defined by $f(\theta, L) := L\hat{g}(\theta)$ is a submersion. Therefore, by the transversality theorem [5, p. 68] (or see [7, Theorem 2.7] for a more precise version), the set $U \subset \mathrm{SL}(2,\mathbb{R})$ formed by those $L$ such that $f(\cdot, L)\colon \mathbb{T} \times \mathrm{SL}(2,\mathbb{R}) \to Y$ is transverse to $Z_1$ and to $Z_2$ is open and dense in $\mathrm{SL}(2,\mathbb{R})$. Take $L \in U$. Noting that $f(\cdot, L) = \widehat{L \circ g}$, it follows from Lemma 2.2 that $LK \in \mathcal{K}^\times$. □

This proposition yields the denseness of $\mathcal{K}^\times$ in $\mathcal{K}$:

*Proof of Proposition 1.2.* Given $K \in \mathcal{K}$, we initially perturb it w.r.t. the symmetric difference metric so the boundary becomes smooth: for example, we can take an inscribed polygon, smoothen the corners, and inflate it to normalize the area. Then by Proposition 2.3 we can apply a element of $\mathrm{SL}(2,\mathbb{R})$ close to the identity and so obtain the desired approximation in $\mathcal{K}^\times$. □

We are left to prove the lemmas.

*Proof of Lemma 2.1.* The *QR decomposition* comes in handy: there is a diffeomorphism $\Phi\colon \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{T} \to \mathrm{SL}(2,\mathbb{R})$ given by:

$$\Phi(\tau, \lambda, \xi) := \begin{pmatrix} e^{-\tau/2} & \lambda \\ 0 & e^{\tau/2} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \cos\xi & -\sin\xi \\ \sin\xi & \cos\xi \end{pmatrix}.$$

Changing coordinates under $\Phi$, the left action of the diagonal subgroup corresponds to translation of the first coordinate.

Let $Y$ be as in the proof of Proposition 2.3. Define a diffeomorphism $\Psi\colon \mathrm{SL}(2,\mathbb{R}) \to Y$ by $\Psi(L) := (Le_1, [Le_2])$, where $\{e_1, e_2\}$ is the canonical basis of $\mathbb{R}^2$. So the map $\Psi \circ \Phi$ allows us to put global coordinates $(t, \lambda, \xi)$ on $Y$.

Note that, in the coordinates just described, $\widehat{\partial E_0}$ is given by equations $t = 0$, $\lambda = 0$. So, applying the diagonal subgroup, we conclude that $Z_2$ is the surface $\lambda = 0$. Analogously, $Z_1$ corresponds to $\lambda = 0$ and $\xi \in \{\pm\frac{\pi}{4}, \pm\frac{3\pi}{4}\}$. This proves Lemma 2.1. □

*Proof of Lemma 2.2.* Let $K \in \mathcal{K}$ and suppose that $\partial K$ has a regular parametrization $g$ such that $\hat{g}$ is transverse to both $Z_1$ and $Z_2$. It is clear that each parameter $\theta_0$ for which $\hat{g}(\theta_0) \in Z_2$ corresponds to a point where $\partial K$ is tangent to one of the ellipses $\partial E_t$, say $\partial E_{t_0}$. By transversality, the number of such parameters is finite, so we obtain condition (b) in the definition of $\mathcal{K}^\times$.

Choose a regular parametrization $h\colon \mathbb{T} \to \mathbb{R}^2$ of $\partial E_{t_0}$ such that $\hat{h}(\theta_0) = \hat{g}(\theta_0)$. Now suppose that $\partial K$ and $\partial E_{t_0}$ have a *second-order* contact at the point $g(\theta_0)$. Then two curves $\hat{g}$ and $\hat{h}$ have a first-order contact (i.e. are tangent) at $\theta_0$. Since $\hat{h}$ is an immersion whose image is contained in $Z_2$, we conclude that $\hat{g}$ is *not* transverse to $Z_2$, which is a contradiction. This proves condition (c) in the definition of $\mathcal{K}^\times$.

Since $Z_1$ is 1-dimensional, $\hat{g}$ is transverse to $Z_1$ iff its image does not intersect $Z_1$: this is equivalent to condition (d), concluding the proof that $K \in \mathcal{K}^\times$. □

## 3. Proof of Proposition 1.3

3.1. **Formulas for the derivatives.** In this subsection, we will prove Proposition 1.3 up to part (a), and also deduce some formulas for the derivatives that will be the basis for the proof of part (b).

Let $K \in \mathcal{K}^\times$. By applying a suitable element of $\mathrm{SL}(2,\mathbb{R})$ that preserves the $x$ and $y$ axes, it is sufficient to consider $t = 0$.

First, assume that $0 \notin T$, so the curves $\partial K$ and $\partial E_0$ are transverse. Then they intersect at $4n$ points, which we list in counterclockwise order as $\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_{4n}$. Extend this to a periodic two-sided sequence $(\zeta_j)_{j\in\mathbb{Z}}$ and lift it to an increasing two-sided sequence $(\xi_j)_{j\in\mathbb{Z}}$ in $\mathbb{R}$ such that $(\cos\xi_j, \sin\xi_j) = \zeta_j$ and $\xi_{j+4n} = \xi_j + 2\pi$ for each $j$. Actually, since $K$ is centrally symmetric, $\xi_{j+2n} = \xi_j + \pi$.

Shifting indices by 1 if necessary, we assume that the following condition holds: if the curve $\partial K$ is traversed counterclockwise, then it exits the unit disk $E_0$ at the points $\zeta_j$ with $j$ even, and enters it at the points $\zeta_j$ with $j$ odd: see Fig. 1. Let $\alpha_j > 0$ denote the non-oriented angles of intersection; note that $\alpha_j < \pi/2$ since $K$ is centrally symmetric. So $(\alpha_j)_{j\in\mathbb{Z}}$ is a two-sided sequence with period $2n$.




Figure 1. Intersections between the curve $\partial K$ and the circle $\partial E_0$.

**Lemma 3.1.** *The function $A$ is $C^2$ at a neighborhood of $0$ and*

$$A'(0) = \sum_{j=1}^{2n} (-1)^{j+1} \sin 2\xi_j \,, \tag{3.1}$$

$$A''(0) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^{2n} \left[ (-1)^j \sin 4\xi_j + \frac{1+\cos 4\xi_j}{\tan \alpha_j} \right] . \tag{3.2}$$

*Proof.* In polar coordinates $(r, \theta)$, the ellipse $\partial E_t$ has equation:

$$r^2 = \frac{1}{e^t \cos^2 \theta + e^{-t} \sin^2 \theta} \,.$$

Similarly, the curve $\partial K$ is represented by some equation $r^2 = G(\theta)$, where $G$ is a positive $C^2$ function on the circle $\mathbb{R}/2\pi\mathbb{Z}$ which satisfies $G(\theta + \pi) = G(\theta)$. Since $\partial K$ and $\partial E_0$ are transverse, $G - 1$ vanishes exactly on the points $\xi_1, \ldots, \xi_{4n}$, and

$$(-1)^j G'(\xi_j) > 0 \tag{3.3}$$

for each $j$.

Let $f(\theta, t) \coloneqq G(\theta) - 1/(e^t \cos^2 \theta + e^{-t} \sin^2 \theta)$. By the Implicit Function Theorem, for $t$ sufficiently close to 0, the function $f(\cdot, t)$ vanishes on $4n$ points $\xi_1(t), \ldots, \xi_{4n}(t)$; moreover each $\xi_j(\cdot)$ is $C^2$ and satisfies $\xi_j(0) = \xi_j$ and

$$\xi_j'(t) = -\frac{f_t(\xi_j(t), t)}{f_\theta(\xi_j(t), t)} \,.$$

Then:

$$\begin{aligned} A(t) &= \frac{1}{2} \int_0^{2\pi} |f(\theta, t)| \, \mathrm{d}\theta = \int_0^{\pi} |f(\theta, t)| \, \mathrm{d}\theta \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^{2n} (-1)^j \int_{\xi_j(t)}^{\xi_{j+1}(t)} f(\theta, t) \, \mathrm{d}\theta \,. \end{aligned} \tag{3.4}$$

By Leibniz integral rule,

$$A'(t) = \sum_{j=1}^{2n} (-1)^j \left[ \int_{\xi_j(t)}^{\xi_{j+1}(t)} f_t(\theta, t) \, \mathrm{d}\theta + \underbrace{f(\xi_{j+1}(t), t)}_{0} \xi_{j+1}'(t) - \underbrace{f(\xi_j(t), t)}_{0} \xi_j'(t) \right] , \tag{3.5}$$

$$\begin{aligned} A''(t) &= \sum_{j=1}^{2n} (-1)^j \left[ \int_{\xi_j(t)}^{\xi_{j+1}(t)} f_{tt}(\theta, t) \, \mathrm{d}\theta + f_t(\xi_{j+1}(t), t) \xi_{j+1}'(t) - f_t(\xi_j(t), t) \xi_j'(t) \right] \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^{2n} (-1)^j \left[ \int_{\xi_j(t)}^{\xi_{j+1}(t)} f_{tt}(\theta, t) \, \mathrm{d}\theta - 2 f_t(\xi_j(t), t) \xi_j'(t) \right] \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^{2n} (-1)^j \left[ \int_{\xi_j(t)}^{\xi_{j+1}(t)} f_{tt}(\theta, t) \, \mathrm{d}\theta + \frac{2[f_t(\xi_j(t), t)]^2}{f_\theta(\xi_j(t), t)} \right] . \end{aligned} \tag{3.6}$$

In particular, $A$ is a $C^2$ function in a neighborhood of 0, as claimed.

Now we consider $t = 0$. A computation gives

$$f_t(\theta, 0) = \cos 2\theta \quad \text{and} \quad f_{tt}(\theta, 0) = -\cos 4\theta.$$

Plugging into (3.5),

$$A'(0) = \sum_{j=1}^{2n} (-1)^j \frac{\sin 2\xi_{j+1} - \sin 2\xi_j}{2} = \sum_{j=1}^{2n} (-1)^{j+1} \sin 2\xi_j \,,$$

proving (3.1). Analogously, from (3.5) we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} A''(0) &= \sum_{j=1}^{2n} (-1)^j \left[ \frac{-\sin 4\xi_{j+1} + \sin 4\xi_j}{4} + \frac{2\cos^2 2\xi_j}{G'(\xi_j)} \right] \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^{2n} \left[ \frac{(-1)^j \sin 4\xi_j}{2} + \frac{1 + \cos 4\xi_j}{|G'(\xi_j)|} \right] , \end{aligned}$$

where in the last step we have used (3.3). Since $|G'(\xi_j)| = 2\tan\alpha_j$, we obtain (3.2). □

*Proof of Proposition 1.3 up to part (a).* It follows from Lemma 3.1 that the function $A$ is $C^2$ except at the points $t$ in $T$ (the set of tangency parameters). Consider such a point. As before, we can assume $t = 0$. Define functions $G(\theta)$ and $f(\theta, t)$ as in the proof of the lemma above.

Fix numbers $\tau_1 < \tau_2 < \cdots < \tau_{2\ell}$ with $\tau_{i+\ell} = \tau_i + \pi$ such that the tangencies between $\partial K$ and the unit circle $\partial E_0$ occur at the points $(\cos\tau_i, \sin\tau_i)$. Then for each $i$ we have then $G(\tau_i) = 1$, $G'(\tau_i) = 0$, $G''(\tau_i) \neq 0$, and $f_t(\tau, 0) \neq 0$; these last two properties follow respectively from conditions (c) and (d) of the definition of $\mathcal{K}^\times$.

In order to correct the formula (3.4) to take the tangencies into account, for each $i$ we need to add a certain correction term $C_i(t)$, which we describe next. Consider for instance the case where $G''(\tau_i) < 0$ and $f_t(\tau_i, 0) > 0$, which we call type $(-,+)$. For each $t$ sufficiently close to zero, consider the equation $f(\theta, t) = 0$ for $\theta$ in a neighborhood of $\tau_i$: it has no solution $\theta$ for $t > 0$, exactly one solution $\tau_i$ for $t = 0$, and exactly two solutions $\tau_i^-(t) < \tau_i^+(t)$ for $t < 0$. Then the correction term is:

$$C_i(t) = 2 \int_{\tau_i^-(t)}^{\tau_i^+(t)} f(\theta, t) \quad \text{if } t < 0,$$

and $C_i(t) = 0$ if $t \geqslant 0$. For $t < 0$ close to 0, the width $\tau_i^+(t) - \tau_i^-(t)$ is $\Theta(|t|^{1/2})$, and the correction term $C_i(t)$ is $\Theta(|t|^{3/2})$. So this tangency forces the left derivative $A'_-(0)$ to be $-\infty$. The other cases are similar. The upshot is:

$$A'_-(0) = \begin{cases} -\infty & \text{if there is at least one tangency of type } (\mp, \pm), \\ \text{finite} & \text{otherwise;} \end{cases}$$

$$A'_+(0) = \begin{cases} +\infty & \text{if there is at least one tangency of type } (\pm, \pm), \\ \text{finite} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Therefore the statement (a) of Proposition 1.3 holds. □

3.2. **Geometric inequalities.** We assume $0 \notin T$ and keep the notation from subsection 3.1. Before going into the the proof of part (b) of Proposition 1.3 itself, we will establish some preliminary inequalities.

It is convenient to reparameterize the sequence $(\xi_j)$ differently. For each $i \in \mathbb{Z}$, let:

$$\sigma_i := \xi_{2i} + \xi_{2i-1}\,, \quad \omega_i := \xi_{2i} - \xi_{2i-1}\,. \tag{3.7}$$

So $\sigma_{i+n} = \sigma_i + 2\pi$, $\omega_{i+n} = \omega_i$, and $0 < \omega_i < \pi$.

**Lemma 3.2.** *For each $i$ we have* $\max(\alpha_{2i-1}, \alpha_{2i}) \leqslant \frac{1}{2}\omega_i$.

*Proof.* Fig. 2 shows how to bound $\alpha_{2i}$. The bound for $\alpha_{2i-1}$ is analogous. □




FIGURE 2. Proof of Lemma 3.2.

Next, we want some bounds on the parameters $\omega_i$. Shifting indices if necessary, we assume that

$$\omega_1 = \max\{\omega_1, \omega_2, \dots, \omega_n\}.$$

If $n \geqslant 2$, we fix $s \in \{2, \dots, n\}$ such that $\omega_s = \max\{\omega_2, \dots, \omega_n\}$. Note that $\sum_{i=1}^{n} \omega_i < \pi$ and in particular $\omega_s < \pi - \omega_1 \leqslant \frac{\pi}{2}$.

The following lemma uses the other hypothesis from part (b) of Proposition 1.3, namely that $A(0)$ is not too close to 0 nor to $2\pi$.

**Lemma 3.3.** *For every $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $\kappa > 0$, not depending on $K$, such that if $\varepsilon \leqslant A(0) \leqslant 2\pi - \varepsilon$ then:*

$$\kappa < \omega_1 < \pi - \kappa \tag{3.8}$$

*and, if $n \geqslant 2$,*

$$\omega_s < \frac{\pi}{2} - \kappa\,. \tag{3.9}$$

*Proof.* Note that $K$ contains the disk of radius $\cos \frac{1}{2}\omega_1$ centered at the origin (see Fig. 3), and in particular:

$$A(0) = 2\pi - 2\operatorname{area}(K \cap E_0) \leqslant 2\pi \sin^2 \tfrac{1}{2}\omega_1\,.$$

So $A(0) \geqslant \varepsilon$ implies $\omega_1 \geqslant 2(\arcsin \frac{\varepsilon}{2\pi})^{1/2}$, proving the first inequality in (3.8).

Now consider (3.9): if this inequality does not hold then $\omega_1$ and $\omega_s$ are both approximately $\frac{\pi}{2}$. Then we can show that $K \smallsetminus E_0$ is contained in the union of four small regions (see Fig. 4), and so $A(0)$ is again close to 0.




FIGURE 3. Proof of the first inequality in (3.8).




FIGURE 4. Proof of (3.9).

The second inequality in (3.8) is trickier. Consider regions $R = R_1 \sqcup R_2$ and $G = G_1 \sqcup G_2$ as in Fig. 5, such that:

$$E_0 \smallsetminus K \supset R\,,$$
$$K \smallsetminus E_0 \subset G\,.$$

In particular,

$$\operatorname{area}(R) \leqslant \frac{A(0)}{2} \leqslant \operatorname{area}(G)\,. \tag{3.10}$$




FIGURE 5. Proof of the second inequality in (3.8).

The areas of the regions $R_1$ and $R_2$ are functions of the corresponding intersection angles:

$$\operatorname{area}(R_i) = \alpha_i - \tfrac{1}{2}\sin 2\alpha_i\,.$$

So

$$\operatorname{area}(R) = \operatorname{area}(R_1) + \operatorname{area}(R_2) \geqslant 2\bar\alpha - \tfrac{1}{2}\sin 4\bar\alpha\,, \tag{3.11}$$

where $\bar\alpha := \frac{1}{2}(\alpha_1 + \alpha_2)$.

On the other hand, the triangles $G_i$ have an angle $\gamma := \omega_1 - 2\bar\alpha$ with opposite side $\ell := 2\cos\frac{1}{2}\omega_1$. So the area of $G_i$ cannot exceed the area of an isosceles triangle with angle $\gamma$ and opposite side $\ell$, that is,

$$\operatorname{area}(G_i) \leqslant \tfrac{1}{4}\ell^2\cot\tfrac{\gamma}{2} = \cot\left(\tfrac{1}{2}\omega_1 - \bar\alpha\right)\cos^2\tfrac{1}{2}\omega_1\,. \tag{3.12}$$

So $\operatorname{area}(R) \leqslant \operatorname{area}(G)$ yields:

$$2\bar\alpha - \tfrac{1}{2}\sin 4\bar\alpha \leqslant 2\cot\left(\tfrac{1}{2}\omega_1 - \bar\alpha\right)\cos^2\tfrac{1}{2}\omega_1\,.$$

In particular:

$$\left(\bar\alpha - \tfrac{1}{4}\sin 4\bar\alpha\right)\sin\left(\tfrac{1}{2}\omega_1 - \bar\alpha\right) \leqslant \cos^2\tfrac{1}{2}\omega_1$$

and therefore:

$$\bar\alpha - \tfrac{1}{4}\sin 4\bar\alpha \leqslant \cos\tfrac{1}{2}\omega_1 \quad \text{or} \tag{3.13}$$

$$\sin\left(\tfrac{1}{2}\omega_1 - \bar\alpha\right) \leqslant \cos\tfrac{1}{2}\omega_1\,. \tag{3.14}$$

Now suppose $\omega_1$ is close to $\pi$ (otherwise there is nothing to show). There are two cases:

- If (3.13) holds then $\bar\alpha$ is small, which by (3.12) implies that $\operatorname{area}(G)$ is small, and so (3.10) yields that $A(0)$ is small.
- If (3.14) holds then $\frac{1}{2}\omega_1 - \bar\alpha$ is small, that is, $\bar\alpha$ is close to $\frac{\pi}{2}$; then (3.11) implies that $\operatorname{area}(R)$ is close to $\pi$, and (3.10) yields that $A(0)$ is close to $2\pi$.

As a result, the assumption $\varepsilon \leqslant A(0) \leqslant 2\pi - \varepsilon$ forbids $\omega_1$ to approach $\pi$. This completes the proof of the second inequality in (3.8) and of the lemma. □

3.3. **More manipulation of the derivatives.** We will now come back to the formulas obtained in Lemma 3.1 and rewrite them in terms of the new parameters (3.7); we will also use Lemma 3.2 to obtain a convenient lower bound for the second derivative.

**Lemma 3.4.**

$$A'(0) = -2\sum_{i=1}^{n}\sin\omega_i\cos\sigma_i\,, \tag{3.15}$$

$$A''(0) \geqslant 2\sum_{i=1}^{n}\left[\sin\omega_i\sin^2\sigma_i + (\cot\tfrac{1}{2}\omega_i - \sin\omega_i)\cos^2\sigma_i\right]\,. \tag{3.16}$$

*Proof.* We can rewrite (3.1) as

$$A'(0) = -\sum_{i=1}^{n}(\sin 2\xi_{2i} - \sin 2\xi_{2i-1})\,,$$

so (3.15) follows from the identity

$$\sin x - \sin y = 2\sin\frac{x-y}{2}\cos\frac{x+y}{2}\,.$$

Analogously, rewriting (3.2) as

$$A''(0) = \frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\left[\sin 4\xi_{2i} - \sin 4\xi_{2i-1} + \frac{1+\cos 4\xi_{2i}}{\tan\alpha_{2i}} + \frac{1+\cos 4\xi_{2i-1}}{\tan\alpha_{2i-1}}\right].$$

By Lemma 3.2, $\max(\alpha_{2i},\alpha_{2i-1}) \leqslant \frac{1}{2}\omega_i$. So, using the identity

$$\cos x + \cos y = 2\cos\frac{x-y}{2}\cos\frac{x+y}{2}$$

we obtain:

$$A''(0) \geqslant \sum_{i=1}^{n}\left[\sin 2\omega_i\cos 2\sigma_i + \cot\tfrac{1}{2}\omega_i\left(1+\cos 2\omega_i\cos 2\sigma_i\right)\right].$$

Let us manipulate the quantity between square brackets. For simplicity of writing, we omit the $i$ indices:

$$\begin{aligned}
[\dots] &= \underbrace{\sin 2\omega}_{2\sin\omega\cos\omega}\cos 2\sigma + \cot\tfrac{1}{2}\omega\left[\underbrace{(-1+\cos 2\omega)}_{-2\sin^2\omega}\cos 2\sigma + \underbrace{(1+\cos 2\sigma)}_{2\cos^2\sigma}\right]\\
&= 2\sin\omega\underbrace{\left(\cos\omega - \cot\tfrac{1}{2}\omega\,\sin\omega\right)}_{1}\underbrace{\cos 2\sigma}_{\cos^2\sigma-\sin^2\sigma} + 2\cot\tfrac{1}{2}\omega\cos^2\sigma\\
&= 2\sin\omega\sin^2\sigma + 2\left(\cot\tfrac{1}{2}\omega - \sin\omega\right)\cos^2\sigma,
\end{aligned}$$

yielding (3.16). □

3.4. **Proof of the main inequality (1.2).** The proof is a case-by-case analysis; in most of the cases we will show that $A''(0)$ is positive and away from zero, but in a few cases the conclusion is that $A'(0)$ is away from zero. All the estimates on those derivatives will be obtained from Lemma 3.4, which will not be explicitly mentioned. Let us introduce some notation:

$$\begin{aligned}
f(\omega) &:= \cot\tfrac{1}{2}\omega - \sin\omega = \cot\omega - \csc\omega - \sin\omega,\\
g(\omega,\sigma) &:= \sin\omega\sin^2\sigma + f(\omega)\cos^2\sigma.
\end{aligned}$$

So the fundamental inequality (3.16) can be rewritten as:

$$\tfrac{1}{2}A''(0) \geqslant \sum_{i=1}^{n} g(\omega_i,\sigma_i). \tag{3.17}$$

Note that $g(\omega,\sigma)$ is a convex combination of the two functions $\sin\omega$ and $f(\omega)$, which are plotted in Fig. 6. We will use this fact repeatedly to obtain bounds. Note that the abscissa of the crossing between the two graphs is $\frac{\pi}{3}$, that $\min g = \min f > -0.31$, and that

$$f(\omega) \geqslant -\tfrac{1}{2}\sin\omega \quad \forall\omega\in(0,\pi). \tag{3.18}$$

Recall that $\omega_1$ is the biggest of all angles $\omega_i$'s and so it is the only angle that can be bigger than $\frac{\pi}{2}$; therefore the sum in (3.17) contains at most one negative term.




FIGURE 6. Plot of the functions sin and $f$.

**Case 1.** $|\cos\sigma_1| \leqslant 0.8$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
\tfrac{1}{2}A''(0) &\geqslant g(\omega_1,\sigma_1)\\
&= \sin\omega_1 \sin^2\sigma_1 + f(\omega_1)\cos^2\sigma_1\\
&\geqslant \sin\omega_1 \left(\sin^2\sigma_1 - \tfrac{1}{2}\cos^2\sigma_1\right) && \text{(by (3.18))}\\
&\geqslant \sin\omega_1 \left(0.36 - \tfrac{1}{2}0.64\right)\\
&\geqslant 0.02\sin\kappa && \text{(by the first inequality in (3.8))}\\
&> 0,
\end{aligned}$$

so we obtain (1.2)

In the remaining cases, we assume $\boxed{|\cos\sigma_1| > 0.8}$.

**Case 2.** $n = 1$. Then, by the first inequality in (3.8),

$$\tfrac{1}{2}|A'(0)| = \sin\omega_1|\cos\sigma_1| > 0.8\sin\kappa > 0\,.$$

In the remaining cases, we assume $\boxed{n \geqslant 2}$.

**Case 3.** $\omega_1 \leqslant \frac{3\pi}{8}$. Then, by the first inequality in (3.8),

$$\tfrac{1}{2}A''(0) \geqslant g(\omega_1,\sigma_1) \geqslant \min\big\{\sin\omega_1, f(\omega_1)\big\} \geqslant \min\big\{\sin\kappa, f(\tfrac{3\pi}{8})\big\} > 0\,.$$

In the remaining cases, we assume $\boxed{\omega_1 > \frac{3\pi}{8}}$. Recall from subsection 3.2 that $\omega_s$ is the second biggest of the $\omega_i$'s.

**Case 4.** $\omega_s \geqslant \frac{\pi}{3}$. So:

$$\begin{aligned}
\tfrac{1}{2}A''(0) &\geqslant g(\omega_1,\sigma_1) + g(\omega_s,\sigma_s)\\
&\geqslant f(\omega_1) + f(\omega_s) && \text{(since } \omega_1 \geqslant \omega_s \geqslant \tfrac{\pi}{3}\text{)}
\end{aligned}$$

Now, $\omega_1 < \pi - \omega_s \leqslant \frac{2\pi}{3}$ and the function $f$ is decreasing on the interval $(0, \frac{2\pi}{3}]$ (actually, it is decreasing on a slightly bigger interval), so:

$$\tfrac{1}{2}A''(0) \geqslant f(\pi-\omega_s) + f(\omega_s) = 2(\csc - \sin)(\omega_s).$$

Now, using (3.9) we obtain:

$$\tfrac{1}{2}A''(0) \geqslant 2(\csc - \sin)(\tfrac{\pi}{2} - \kappa) > 0$$

and we are done in this case.

In the remaining cases, we assume $\boxed{\omega_s < \frac{\pi}{3}}$. Define the following numbers:

$$\begin{aligned}\kappa' &:= 0.1 \sin\kappa\,,\\ \Lambda &:= \max\big\{-g(\omega_1,\sigma_1), 0\big\} + \kappa'\,,\\ \Sigma &:= \sum_{i=2}^{n} g(\omega_i,\sigma_i)\,.\end{aligned}$$

**Case 5.** $\Sigma \geqslant \Lambda$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}\tfrac{1}{2}A''(0) &= \Sigma + g(\omega_1,\sigma_1)\\ &\geqslant \Sigma + \kappa' - \Lambda\\ &\geqslant \kappa'\end{aligned}$$

and we are done.

In the final and most interesting case, we assume $\boxed{\Sigma < \Lambda}$.

**Case 6.** Let us establish two upper estimates for $\Lambda$; the first is:

$$\Lambda \leqslant \max(-g) + \kappa' < 0.31 + \kappa' < 0.41\,, \tag{3.19}$$

and the second is:

$$\begin{aligned}\Lambda &\leqslant -g(\omega_1,\sigma_1) + \kappa'\\ &\leqslant -f(\omega_1) + \kappa' \qquad (\text{since } \omega_1 > \tfrac{3\pi}{8} > \tfrac{\pi}{3})\\ &\leqslant \tfrac{1}{2}\sin\omega_1 + \kappa' \qquad (\text{by (3.18)}).\end{aligned} \tag{3.20}$$

Define:

$$\Delta := \arcsin\Lambda,$$

which by (3.19), satisfies $\Delta < 0.43$.

Note that

$$\sin\Delta = \Lambda > \Sigma \geqslant g(\omega_s,\sigma_s) \geqslant \sin\omega_s \qquad (\text{since } \omega_s < \tfrac{\pi}{3}),$$

that is, $\boxed{\omega_s \leqslant \Delta}$.

Let $\varphi(\omega) := f(\omega) - \sin(\omega)$. We can rewrite $\Sigma$ as:

$$\Sigma = \sum_{i=2}^{n} \left[\sin\omega_i + \varphi(\omega_i)\cos^2\sigma_i\right]\,.$$

Since $\omega_s \leqslant \Delta < \frac{\pi}{3}$ and the function $\varphi$ is positive and decreasing on the interval $(0, \frac{\pi}{3})$, the assumption $\Sigma < \Lambda$ yields two other inequalities:

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{i=2}^{n} \sin\omega_i &< \Lambda\,,\\ \sum_{i=2}^{n} \cos^2\sigma_i &< \frac{\Lambda}{\varphi(\Delta)}\,.\end{aligned}$$

So, on one hand,

$$\sum_{i=2}^{n} \sin^2\omega_i \leqslant \sin\omega_s \sum_{i=2}^{n} \sin\omega_i \leqslant \Lambda^2\,.$$

On the other hand, recalling that $\Lambda = \sin\Delta$ and $\varphi(\Delta) = \cot\Delta + \csc\Delta - 2\sin\Delta$,

$$\sum_{i=2}^{n} \cos^2\sigma_i < \frac{\Lambda}{\varphi(\Delta)} = \frac{\Lambda^2}{\cos\Delta + 1 - 2\sin^2\Delta} \leqslant \frac{\Lambda^2}{\cos 0.43 + 1 - 2\sin^2 0.43} < 0.65\Lambda^2 .$$

By Cauchy–Schwarz inequality,

$$\left|\sum_{i=2}^{n} \sin\omega_i \cos\sigma_i\right| \leqslant \sqrt{\sum_{i=2}^{n} \sin^2\omega_i \times \sum_{i=2}^{n} \cos^2\sigma_i} < \sqrt{\Lambda^2 \times 0.65\Lambda^2} = 0.81\Lambda^2 < \Lambda .$$

This inequality together with (3.20) allows us to show that $A'(0)$ is not too close to zero:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{|A'(0)|}{2} &\geqslant \left|\sin\omega_1 \cos\sigma_1\right| - \left|\sum_{i=2}^{n} \sin\omega_i \cos\sigma_i\right| \\ &\geqslant 0.8 \sin\omega_1 - \Lambda \\ &\geqslant 0.3 \sin\omega_1 - \kappa' \\ &\geqslant 0.2 \sin\kappa \\ &> 0 . \end{aligned}$$

This concludes the proof of part (b) of Proposition 1.3.

## 4. Proof of Theorem 2

To begin, let us refine the consequences of Proposition 1.3. Consider $K \in \mathcal{K}^\times$ and let $A(t) := d(K, E_t)$. Trivially, $A(t) \to 2\pi$ as $t \to \pm\infty$. Let us say that $t \in \mathbb{R}$ is a *critical point* if $A'(t)$ either does not exist (i.e., $t \in T$) or is zero. It follows from Proposition 1.3 that there are only finitely many critical points, and that there exists exactly one of them, say $t_*$, such that $A$ is decreasing on $(-\infty, t_*]$ and increasing on $[t_*, +\infty)$. Given $\varepsilon > 0$, let

$$R_\varepsilon := \left\{ t \geqslant t_* \,;\, \varepsilon \leqslant A(t) \leqslant 2\pi - \varepsilon \right\} .$$

This is a (possibly empty) compact interval. Let $\delta = \delta(\varepsilon)$ be given by part (b) of Proposition 1.3, and consider:

$$R_\varepsilon^{\text{slow}} := \left\{ t \in R_\varepsilon \,;\, 0 \leqslant A'_-(t) \leqslant \delta \right\} .$$

It follows from Proposition 1.3 that $R_\varepsilon^{\text{slow}}$ is either empty or a compact interval with the same left endpoint as $R_\varepsilon$; in the latter case, the restriction of $A$ to $R_\varepsilon^{\text{slow}}$ is $C^2$. Analogous facts hold for the sets:

$$\begin{aligned} L_\varepsilon &:= \left\{ t \leqslant t_* \,;\, \varepsilon \leqslant A(t) \leqslant 2\pi - \varepsilon \right\} , \\ L_\varepsilon^{\text{slow}} &:= \left\{ t \in L_\varepsilon \,;\, -\delta \leqslant A'_+(t) \leqslant 0 \right\} . \end{aligned}$$

We use this information to obtain the following:

**Lemma 4.1.** *Given $\varepsilon > 0$ and $0 < r < 1$, there exists $\eta > 0$ such that for every $K \in \mathcal{K}^\times$, the function $A(t) := d(K, E_t)$ has the following property: for every $t_0 \in \mathbb{R}$, if $\varepsilon \leqslant A(t_0) \leqslant 2\pi - 2\varepsilon$ then $\min\{A(t_0 - r), A(t_0 + r)\} \geqslant A(t_0) + \eta$.*

*Proof.* Let $\varepsilon > 0$ and $0 < r < 1$ be given. Let $\delta > 0$ be given by Proposition 1.3 and let $\eta := \min\left\{\varepsilon, \frac{1}{2}\delta r^2\right\}$. Now fix $K \in \mathcal{K}^\times$ and consider the intervals $L_\varepsilon \supset L_\varepsilon^{\text{slow}}$ and $R_\varepsilon \supset R_\varepsilon^{\text{slow}}$ as in the preceding discussion. Fix $t_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $A(t_0) \in [\varepsilon, 2\pi - 2\varepsilon]$. Then $t_0 \in L_\varepsilon \cup R_\varepsilon$. Suppose $t_0 \in R_\varepsilon$, since the other case is analogous. Assume

that $A(t_0 + r) \leqslant 2\pi - \varepsilon$, otherwise there is nothing to prove. Then the interval $J := [t_0, t_0 + r]$ is contained in $R_\varepsilon$. Now consider two cases:

The first case is $J \cap R_\varepsilon^{\text{slow}} = \varnothing$. Then $A' > \delta$ almost everywhere in $J$. Note that the function $A$, which may have points of non-differentiability, still obeys the Fundamental Theorem of Calculus. So we have $A(t_0 + r) - A(t_0) \geqslant \delta r > \eta$, completing the proof in this case.

In the remaining case, $J \cap R_\varepsilon^{\text{slow}} = [t_0, t_0 + s]$ for some $s$. Then, recalling that the restriction of $A$ to $R_\varepsilon^{\text{slow}}$ is $C^2$, we have:

$$t \in [t_0, t_0 + s] \;\Rightarrow\; A'(t) = \underbrace{A'_+(t_0)}_{\geqslant 0} + \int_{t_0}^{t} \underbrace{A''(s)}_{>\delta}\, \mathrm{d}s \geqslant \delta(t - t_0)\,,$$

while

$$t \in [t_0 + s, t_0 + r] \;\Rightarrow\; A'(t) \geqslant \delta \geqslant \delta(t - t_0) \text{ as well}$$

(using that $r < 1$). So:

$$A(t_0 + r) - A(t_0) \geqslant \int_{t_0}^{t_0 + r} \delta(t - t_0)\, \mathrm{d}t = \tfrac{1}{2}\delta r^2 \geqslant \eta\,. \qquad \square$$

*Proof of Theorem 2.* Fix $K \in \mathcal{K}$ and let $A(t) := d(K, E_t)$. If $\tilde{K}$ is another element of $\mathcal{K}$, then by the triangle inequality the corresponding function $\tilde{A}(t) := d(\tilde{K}, E_t)$ satisfies:

$$|A(t) - \tilde{A}(t)| \leqslant d(K, \tilde{K}) \quad \text{for all } t \in \mathbb{R}.$$

By Proposition 1.2, we can approximate $K$ by $\tilde{K}$ in $\mathcal{K}^\times$, and by Proposition 1.3 the corresponding function $\tilde{A}$ is (strictly) quasiconvex. Therefore $A$ is the uniform limit of quasiconvex functions and so it is quasiconvex.

Assume for a contradiction that $A$ is not stricly quasiconvex. Then $A$ has a plateau, that is, a non-trivial interval $[t_0 - r, t_0 + r]$, say with $r < 1$, where $A$ is constant, say equal to $c$. Note that $c \neq 0$. Fix a positive $\varepsilon < \min\{c, (2\pi - c)/2\}$, and let $\eta = \eta(\varepsilon, r)$ be given by Lemma 4.1. By Proposition 1.2, there exists $\tilde{K} \in \mathcal{K}^\times$ with $d(\tilde{K}, K) < \frac{1}{2}\eta$. Letting $t_1 = t_0 \pm r$, we have

$$|\tilde{A}(t_1) - \tilde{A}(t_0)| \leqslant |\tilde{A}(t_1) - A(t_1)| + |A(t_1) - A(t_0)| + |A(t_0) - \tilde{A}(t_0)| < \eta\,.$$

This contradicts the conclusion of Lemma 4.1. The theorem is proved. $\square$

## 5. Concluding remarks and questions

Coming back to the uniqueness Theorem 1, let us briefly comment on the problem of now to actually determine the ellipse $E_{\text{best}}$ that best approximates a given $K \in \mathcal{K}$. If $K$ has any non-trivial symmetry (more precisely, there is some $L \in \mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{R}) \smallsetminus \{\pm\mathrm{Id}\}$ such that $L(K) = K$) then $E_{\text{best}}$ must have the same symmetry, and therefore becomes uniquely determined. For example, the best approximation to a regular $2n$-gon is the unit disk.

In the absence of symmetries, the information provided by Theorem 3 should be helpful. For example, if one manages to find a local minimum of the area function then this is automatically the solution. Actually, in most cases it should be sufficient to find a critical point, due to the following result (which follows from the proof of Proposition 1.3):

**Corollary 5.1.** *Let $K \in \mathcal{K}$ and $E_* \in \mathcal{E}$. Suppose that the boundaries of $K$ and $E_*$ intersect at finitely many points, and that $\partial K$ is $C^2$ and transverse to $\partial E_*$ on the neighborhood of each of these points. Then the function $E \in \mathcal{E} \mapsto d(K, E)$ is $C^2$ at a neighborhood of $E_*$. If moreover its gradient vanishes at $E_*$ then $E_*$ is the global minimum.*

Note that the gradient is easy to compute under the assumptions of the Corollary 5.1, as we have seen in subsection 3.1.

Let us remark that quasiconvexity is a very useful property for the design of optimization algorithms: see for instance [2, § 4.2.5].

There are several other natural questions one can ask concerning the metric space $(\mathcal{K}, d)$: what is its diameter, what elements of $\mathcal{K}$ are most distant to $\mathcal{E}$, what is that maximum, etc.

As in [8], we ask for the validity of the uniqueness result in higher dimensions. The space of ellipsoids also has a natural affine structure (see Appendix A.4), so we also ask whether strict quasiconvexity holds.

## Appendix A. Structures induced by the symmetric difference metric

This appendix is not needed for the rest of the paper, but it justifies our definition of segments in the space $\mathcal{E}$. It also has interest on its own.

A.1. **Intrinsic metrics.** Given any metric space $(M, d)$, we can define the (possibly infinite) *length* of a continuous curve $f\colon [0,1] \to M$ as

$$\operatorname{len}_d(f) \coloneqq \sup \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} d(f(t_j), f(t_{j+1}))\,,$$

where the supremum is taken over all choices of points $0 = t_0 < t_1 < \cdots < t_n = 1$. If $M$ is path-connected then we define, for every $x$, $y \in M$

$$\bar{d}(x, y) \coloneqq \inf_f \operatorname{len}_d(f)\,, \tag{A.1}$$

where $f$ runs over all the continuous curves from $x$ to $y$.

Note that $\bar{d} \geqslant d$ and $\bar{d}$ satisfies the usual axioms of a metric, except that it may be infinite. (Actually, it may be identically $\infty$: consider for example the Koch curve.) If $\bar{d}$ is everywhere finite and it induces the same topology as $d$, then we call it the *intrinsic metric* induced by $d$. A curve $f$ that attains the infimum in (A.1) (if it exists) is a called a (parameterized) *geodesic segment* joining $x$ to $y$. See [3, Chapter 2] for much more information on this subject.

A.2. **Geometry of the space of ellipses.** Now consider the metric space $(\mathcal{E}, d)$ where, as before, $\mathcal{E}$ is the set of ellipses with center at the origin and area $\pi$, and $d$ is the symmetric difference metric. A geometric description of the associated length of curves will be given later (see Proposition A.4).

**Proposition A.1.** *$(\mathcal{E}, d)$ induces an intrinsic metric, which is given by the formula:*

$$\bar{d} = 4 \log \tan \left( \frac{d}{8} + \frac{\pi}{4} \right)\,.$$

*Moreover, the geodesic segments coincide with the segments on $\mathcal{E}$ as defined in subsection 1.1.*

In order to prove this proposition, we will actually show that $(\mathcal{E}, \bar{d})$ is a well-known metric space in disguise.

Let $\mathbb{H} := \{z \in \mathbb{C} \ ; \ \operatorname{Im} z > 0\}$ be the upper-half plane, endowed with the Riemannian metric obtained by multiplying the euclidian inner product by $(\operatorname{Im} z)^{-2}$. Let $d_{\mathbb{H}}(\cdot,\cdot)$ be the corresponding distance function. This space has constant curvature $-1$, and its geodesics are either euclidian half-lines or euclidian half-circles orthogonal to the real axis. Moreover, the group $\mathrm{SL}(2,\mathbb{R})$ acts on $\mathbb{H}$ by isometries via Möbius transformations:

$$\begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix} \cdot z := \frac{az+b}{cz+d}\,.$$

The action is transitive, and the stabilizer of $i = \sqrt{-1}$ is $\mathrm{SO}(2)$, the group of rotations. Since the action of $\mathrm{SL}(2,\mathbb{R})$ on $\mathcal{E}$ is also transitive, and the stabilizer of the unit disk $E_0$ is also $\mathrm{SO}(2)$, there exists an unique bijection

$$\psi \colon \mathbb{H} \to \mathcal{E}$$

that sends $i$ to $E_0$ and that commutes with the group action (i.e., $\psi(LE) = L\psi(E)$).

**Proposition A.2.** *$\psi$ defines an isometry between $(\mathbb{H}, 2d_{\mathbb{H}})$ and $(\mathcal{E}, \bar{d})$.*

The first step of the proof is the following computation:

**Lemma A.3.** *For all $t \in \mathbb{R}$,*

$$d(E_0, E_t) = -2\pi + 8 \arctan e^{|t|/2}\,.$$

*Proof.* Initially, consider an arbitrary pair of distinct numbers $t,\ s \in \mathbb{R}$. Then $\partial E_t \cap \partial E_s$ consists on four points $\pm p$, $\pm q$. Consider the following four lines: the two coordinate axes, the line containing $\pm p$, and the line containing $\pm q$. These four lines split the region $E_t \cap E_s$ into eight "slices". We claim that all slices have the same area. In the case that $t + s = 0$, this claim is clearly true by symmetry. Applying the diagonal subgroup of $\mathrm{SL}(2,\mathbb{R})$, we conclude that the claim always holds.

Now consider $s = 0$. Then four of the slices are sectors of the unit disk $E_0$ with central angles $\theta := \arctan e^{-|t|/2} = \frac{\pi}{2} - \arctan e^{|t|/2}$, and therefore all eight slices have area $\theta/2$. So:

$$d(E_0, E_t) = 2\pi - 2\operatorname{area}(E_0 \cap E_t) = 2\pi - 8\theta\,,$$

yielding the announced formula. □

*Proof of Propositions A.1 and A.2.* Pulling back the symmetric difference metric $d$ by the map $\psi$ we obtain a new metric on $\mathbb{H}$:

$$(\psi^* d)(z_1, z_2) := d\big(\psi(z_1), \psi(z_2)\big)\,.$$

For any pair of points $z_1,\ z_2 \in \mathbb{H}$ there exists $L \in \mathrm{SL}(d,\mathbb{R})$ such that $L(z_1) = i$ and $L(z_2) = e^{-t}i$ for some $t \in \mathbb{R}$. Note that $\psi(e^{-t}i) = E_t$ and that $d_{\mathbb{H}}(e^{-t}i, i) = |t|$. So it follows from Lemma A.3 that

$$(\psi^* d)(z_1, z_2) = -2\pi + 8 \arctan e^{d_{\mathbb{H}}(z_1,z_2)/2}\,.$$

In particular,

$$(\psi^* d)(z_1, z_2) = 2d_{\mathbb{H}}(z_1, z_2) + o\big(d_{\mathbb{H}}(z_1, z_2)\big)\,.$$

This property clearly implies that $\psi^* d$ induces the intrinsic metric $\overline{\psi^* d} = 2d_{\mathbb{H}}$. Propositions A.1 and A.2 follow. □

A.3. **Geometric interpretation of the length with respect to the symmetric difference metric.**

**Proposition A.4.** *Suppose that $F\colon [0,1] \to \mathcal{E}$ is a continuous curve. Then the length of $F$ is given by the area integral*

$$\operatorname{len}_d(F) = \iint_{\mathbb{R}^2} N(x,y)\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}y\,,$$

*where $N(x,y) \coloneqq \operatorname{card}\{t \in [0,1]\,;\,(x,y) \in \partial F(t)\}$.*

In informal terms, $\operatorname{len}_d(F)$ measures the area of $\bigcup_{t\in[0,1]} \partial F(t)$ with multiplicities; thus we call it the *footprint length* of the path $F$. To illustrate, Fig. 7 shows the case where $F$ is a parametrized segment $[E_{-c}, E_c]$.




FIGURE 7. A path $F$ and the associated function $N$.

The proof of Proposition A.4 is omitted.

*Remark* A.5. The "footprint" characterization of length given by Proposition A.4 also makes sense in the larger space $(\mathcal{K}, d)$.

*Remark* A.6. Unlike $(\mathcal{E}, d)$, geodesic segments are not unique in the space $(\mathcal{K}, d)$: for example if $t$ is sufficiently small then there exist many curves in $\mathcal{K}$ from $E_0$ to $E_t$ with footprint length equal to $d(E_0, E_t) = \operatorname{area}(E_0 \mathbin{\triangle} E_t)$.

A.4. **Higher dimension.** We briefly comment on how what was done above extends (or not) to higher dimension, omitting the proofs.

Let $\mathcal{E}_n$ be space of ellipsoids in $\mathbb{R}^n$ with center at the origin and the same volume as the unit ball, endowed with the symmetric difference metric $d_n$. There is an associated intrinsic metric $\bar{d}_n$; moreover geodesic segments always exist and are unique modulo reparametrization. There is a bijection $\psi_n$ between the symmetric space $P_n \coloneqq \mathrm{SL}(n,\mathbb{R})/\mathrm{SO}(n)$ and the space $\mathcal{E}_n$ that sends the basepoint to the unit ball and that commutes with the action of $\mathrm{SL}(d,\mathbb{R})$. Consider $P_n$ endowed with its unique $\mathrm{SL}(d,\mathbb{R})$-invariant Riemannian metric (which has nonpositive curvature).

Then $\psi_n$ is *not* an isometry, but it is affine: it preserves geodesic segments. The pull-back of $\bar{d}_n$ to $P_n$ is the distance function induced by a $\mathrm{SL}(d,\mathbb{R})$-invariant Finsler non-Riemannian structure. The lengths of curves have a "footprint" characterization similar to Proposition A.4.

*Acknowledgements.* Thanks to Paula Porto for drawing the figures.

## References

[1] Ball, Keith. – An elementary introduction to modern convex geometry. *Flavors of geometry*, 1–58, Math. Sci. Res. Inst. Publ., 31, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 1997. (Cited on page 1.)

[2] Boyd, S.; Vandenberghe, L. – *Convex optimization.* Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 2004. (Cited on pages 1 and 16.)

[3] Burago, D.; Burago, Y.; Ivanov, S. – *A course in metric geometry.* Graduate Studies in Mathematics, 33. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2001. (Cited on page 16.)

[4] Giannopoulos, A.A.; Milman, V.D. – Euclidean structure in finite dimensional normed spaces. *Handbook of the geometry of Banach spaces, Vol. I*, 707–779, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 2001. (Cited on page 1.)

[5] Guillemin, V.; Pollack, A. – *Differential topology.* Prentice-Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs, NJ, 1974. (Cited on page 4.)

[6] Henk, Martin. – Löwner-John ellipsoids. *Doc. Math.* 2012, Extra vol.: Optimization stories, 95–106. (Cited on page 1.)

[7] Hirsch, Morris W. – *Differential topology.* Corrected reprint of the 1976 original. Graduate Texts in Mathematics, 33. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1994. (Cited on page 4.)

[8] Kuperberg, Włodek. – *Approximating a convex disk by an ellipse.* mathoverflow.net/questions/257862 (Cited on pages 2 and 16.)

[9] Lutwak, E.; Yang, D.; Zhang, G. – A new ellipsoid associated with convex bodies. *Duke Math. J.* 104 (2000), no. 3, 375–390. (Cited on page 1.)

*Web-page:* www.mat.uc.cl/~jairo.bochi

*E-mail address*: jairo.bochi@mat.uc.cl

Facultad de Matemáticas, Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile. Avenida Vicuña Mackenna 4860, Santiago, Chile